DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 378 HE 003 607

TITLE	Changing Patterns for Undergraduate Education.
INSTITUTION	College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	45p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Order Office, College Entrance Examination Board, Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 ($1.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bachelors Degrees; Conference Reports; *Degree Requirements; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; *Higher Education; Special Degree Programs; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

This document presents summaries of speeches and discussions held at the conference on changing patterns for undergraduate education sponsored in May 1972 by Harvard University and the College Entrance Examination Board. Participants from more than 100 colleges met at the conference to discuss the following questions: What is the perception of change in process and in prospect from the viewpoint of responsible college administrators? Is there any commonly shared sense of direction and purpose in the changes enveloping the bachelor's degree program? Are the major changes recommended by the Carnegie Commission, in particular the recommendation for a 3-year degree program, likely to be put into effect? How are college administrators responding to demands for independent study, interdisciplinary programs, work projects and experience, removal of distribution requirements, and so forth? What is the perception of the role and function of the bachelor's degree program, the litmus against which the assorted impulses for change ought to be tested? Speeches presented at the conference include: "Directions in Undergraduate Education," "A Collegiate Year in Secondary School," "Shortening and Varying Undergraduate Degree Programs," and "Access and Transition in Higher Education." (HS)

ED 070378

Changing Patterns for Undergraduate Education

Report on a Conference Sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board and Harvard University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
College Entrance Examination Board
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

HE 003 007

College Entrance Examination Board, New York
1972

opies of this booklet may be ordered from Publications Order Office, College Entrance Examination Board, Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. The price is $1.50.

Editorial inquiries concerning this booklet should be directed to Editorial Office, College Entrance Examination Board, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019.

Copyright © 1972 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 72-90932
Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Introduction 4

Speeches on the Issues and the Context of the Conference 6

Directions in Undergraduate Education, Ernest L. Boyer 6

A Collegiate Year in Secondary School, O. William Perlmutter . . 7

Shortening and Varying Undergraduate Degree Programs, Dean K. Whitla 8

Greetings to the Conference Participants, Derek C. Bok 10

Access and Transition, Arland F. Christ-Janer. 12

The Conference Deliberations, Albert G. Sims 14

Appendixes. 24

A. Conference Participants. 24

B. Questions for Discussion. 30

C. Analysis of Questionnaire Responses, Dean K. Whitla 34

Introduction

The conference, cosponsored by Harvard University and the College Entrance Examination Board, brought together at Cambridge on May 18 and 19, 1972, representatives from more than 100 colleges and universities that have Bachelor's degree programs. Invitations were sent to the principal academic officer (usually a dean or academic vice president) at each institution that in 1971-72 received 75 or more College Board Advanced Placement candidates. A limited number of additional invitations was extended to other institutions and organizations. Nearly all those invited accepted, some indication of the prevalence of concern for the conference topic.

The idea for the conference originated with school and college representatives to the College Board and Board staff faced with the problem of how once again to put the Advanced Placement Program at the leading edge of curriculum change in the secondary schools. Started in 1954 as an expression of growing national concern for the nurture of academic talent, this program has rallied a small but influential combination of students and teachers at both secondary and collegiate levels to work together in promoting academic excellence and advanced standing recognition for talented secondary school students. It has become evident, however, that many able students are looking for something more than opportunities to accelerate traditional academic achievement.

Meanwhile, the burden of supporting higher education falls increasingly on the public. The purpose and the performance of educational institutions begin to preoccupy government agencies. In answer to these pressures, educators seek orderly change while maintaining the integrity of the educational function. It is no small task.

This task and how it is being managed became the broader focus for the conference. What is the perception of change in process and in prospect from the viewpoint of responsible college administrators? Is there any commonly shared sense of direction and purpose in the changes enveloping the Bachelor's degree program? Are the major changes set forth in the Carnegie Commission report *Less Time, More Options* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), in particular the recommendation for a three-year degree program, likely to be put into effect? How are college administrators responding to demands for independent study, interdisciplinary programs, work projects and experience, removal of distribution requirements, and so forth? And, most important perhaps, what is the perception of the role and func-

4

tion of the Bachelor's degree program, the litmus against which the assorted impulses for change ought to be tested?

The conferees confronted these questions bravely for a full day, mostly in small groups in which everyone had opportunity to air his views. As might have been expected, no final answers emerged. Nor was there a consensus – except for the strong undercurrent of feeling that the time for apologizing for the condition of undergraduate education is past (if apologies ever were appropriate) and that the need now is for strong educational leadership from those in our colleges and universities who are entrusted with the responsibility for the B.A. programs.

We wish to take special note of the generous grant made by the Rockefeller Foundation to help the sponsors of the conference to cover its costs. We are confident that the participants share with us the sense that this kind of communication about problems common to a great many institutions is a useful opportunity, both for each individual institution and for the educational enterprise they collectively represent.

John T. Dunlop
Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University

Albert G. Sims
Vice President for Programs, College Entrance Examination Board

5

Speeches on the Issues and the Context of the Conference

On the first day of the conference several educators spoke to the participants in accord with the theme of the conference, "Less Time, More Options: Changing Patterns for Undergraduate Education." Summaries of their talks are presented here in greatly condensed form.

Directions in Undergraduate Education

Ernest L. Boyer
Chancellor, State University of New York at Albany

At the time that most of our colleges were founded or took their present forms, the social, technological, and educational circumstances of the day brought about a college model that was four years in length, self-contained, and devoted to a fairly small portion of the nation's youth. Because of the nature of the student clientele and the dominant culture, curriculums tended to be fairly homogeneously oriented to the great intellectual efforts of the past.

Nearly all those circumstances have changed. But the old college model remains fairly much intact, as does a good deal of the old curriculum. The present-day structure of higher education thus suffers from a cultural lag.

Among the circumstances that have changed are the speed and ease of travel; the amount, costs, and dispersal of education equipment and facilities; the rapidity of communications; new media; the amount of instruction in society outside schools and colleges; the nature of work; the intensity of present-day social concerns; and the pace of change itself. Educational preparation for a lifetime has become educational introduction to the next decade. But the most important change perhaps is that of the student clientele. Many more students, with a much better but more varied preparation, an earlier physiological maturity, and different moral and psychological attitudes, are seeking higher education – and for a wider array of purposes. Also, older people now resume or continue their learning in rapidly increasing numbers. As the student body expands and changes in quality, style, age, range, and purpose, colleges need to modify their educational programs in content, length, and location.

As for content, colleges should be more imaginative and flexible in the diversity of programs they offer and their methods of study, both

within most institutions and among all the institutions collectively. As for length, the granite blocks of time need to be replaced with more flexible and cooperative time spans, such as a seven-year school-and-college span, with more interruptions of learning permitted or even encouraged and with a continuing in-and-out educational scheme throughout adult life. And, the location of higher learning should not be limited to one place, but rather adjusted to accept new kinds and techniques of learning that can take place in other locales, other countries, or at home.

The conditions of contemporary life require a new college model—one that harnesses the best of our novel circumstances for the age-old tasks of refining the mind and sensibility, and one that responds creatively to the needs of the more numerous and more diverse students.

A Collegiate Year in Secondary School

O. William Perlmutter
Graduate School of Public Affairs, State University of New York at Albany

I agree with much that has been said here, particularly with Ernest Boyer's thoughts about the significance of educational change and the tremendous importance of nontraditional continuing education.

American education has been particularly successful in responding to pressures for specialization where specific goals have been delineated: professional, academic, and vocational. Unfortunately this has resulted in perpetuating the discrete discipline as the typical form of knowledge, to the detriment of any systematic effort to put together the various fields of learning in an integrated fashion. On the other hand, American education has failed where specialization is not appropriate. We have failed to "socialize" the country—to blend the different ethnic groups and to fuse the various races and creeds. Goals of success have been narrowly defined in terms of job status, prestige, and material acquisition. Our general condition of affluence seems to have led to ennui and boredom. And, despite the fact that we have advanced the social sciences, we have failed to solve the economic, cultural, and social problems that need to be dealt with in political terms. One result of this failure is the decline and decay of our cities.

To correct this undue emphasis on specialization, we should restructure our educational institutions. The last two years at school and the first two at college are in urgent need of review, as this sequence of

years is when, at present, most time is wasted. By shortening the time required for the B.A. degree to three years it would be possible to provide for the nation's high school students a collegiate year of instruction while still at high school Wouldn't it be feasible to abridge the time period, bearing in mind that there is no particular magic in a high school diploma or a B.A. degree that presupposes a particular number of years or credits? Quality education could take the form of various kinds of multidisciplinary studies, including the interdisciplinary approach, the synoptic approach, and reflexive studies. And we should formulate new evaluation techniques for multidisciplinary studies. Another approach that should have a high priority is the transcultural experience. A third important area is independent study, which crosses disciplinary lines, is experimental, may be transcultural, has a minimum of supervision, and has the flexibility to allow recognition by various means.

While maintaining the highest quality of education, we need to give attention to the honesty of our degree structure and to the achievement of a degree candidate, not just the hours he has spent. Students need more opportunities, more variety, less constraint, less coercion. Students deserve greater freedom in the pursuit of knowledge when and where they choose, and we college people have to work more closely with our colleagues in the secondary school to achieve this goal.

Shortening and Varying Undergraduate Degree Programs

Dean K. Whitla
Professor of Education and Director of the Office of Tests, Harvard University

Two questions that should be central to the operation of any college are these:

1. What kind of data is used for educational planning?
2. What are the developmental theories of growth and learning on which the undergraduate program is based?

An examination of the data used to evaluate program impact at Harvard and of growth trends that seem pronounced here has led me to propose a three-year A.B. degree program. Whether or not you agree with the proposal, you still may find that reflecting on its applicability to your own college is a useful exercise.

A decade ago I did a study on the freshman year at Harvard, showing what a great emotional impact that year had. Students found they

were asked to do things high school just hadn't prepared them to do; as one remarked, "Gee, I memorized everything, but nobody asked me those questions." A coming of insight and exhilaration, however, took place every March, when freshmen finally realized they were capable of making their own critical assessments of assigned material. But Harvard freshmen do not have that same experience now; the sense of malaise present today doesn't disappear by spring. What are students currently seeking?

My interviews with students this spring indicate that they are primarily concerned with self-hood: they want intellectual skills and knowledge, but also personal growth as social beings and a kind of connectedness in learning, to link their own development to the world outside. Other studies of college students also discuss the differences among students primarily in terms of affective, noncognitive growth. Some students develop intellectual style, while others never realize their potential, and these differences are better accounted for by personal maturity than by College Board scores. As stepping stones to this greater maturity, we've found leaves of absence quite successful. During the leave a valuable kind of growth seems to take place and gives the student an invaluable sense of direction; breaking the K-16 treadmill gives the needed psychological lift.

Another study here showed that each of the four college years has different structural qualities: on almost every ranking, the junior year is best, the senior second, the freshman third, and the sophomore a poor fourth. There really is a sophomore slump: grades go down, the freshness and drive of the first year dissipates, and status dwindles as sophomores become the youngest of the upperclassmen. More students see a psychiatrist than in any other year.

Since these interviews, surveys, and analyses seem to indicate that college today doesn't provide an optimal environment for personal development, I propose to allow students to complete the A.B. degree in three years of academic study over a four-year calendar period. Some colleges have made a three-year program by compressing the normal four-year program into three, but this seems to me a mistake, creating even more educational pressure and intensity.

In a way we've already had a lot of experience with a three-year program; it's called Advanced Placement. Our 187 AP seniors last year had splendid careers here after three years, yet of these 187 who could have graduated after three years, only 14 chose to do so, one rushing off to graduate school and the other 13 taking their "leaves of absence."

There has also been much good experience with the junior year abroad. In the three-year program, I'm suggesting a similar format, minimizing the academic component and essentially freeing each student to follow his own interest, preferably in a different culture. Further, it would seem appropriate that the year away from college be the normal sophomore year and that the academic load be reduced rather than compressed, so that the year might possess the beneficial qualities of a leave of absence.

May I suggest a heresy: that data and theories of growth are as important to finding a direction for an institution as are goals. I hope the strength of these arguments, although the specifics may be inappropriate for your college, will invite you to incorporate all three aspects of planning into your style of institutional life.

Greetings to the Conference Participants

Derek C. Bok
President, Harvard University

The opportunity this conference gives us to exchange ideas on innovation in higher education comes during a period of criticism about the importance and relevance of undergraduate education. Despite the timeliness of our collecting new ideas, there are four other problems concerning the development of undergraduate education that should be discussed at future conferences of this kind. One is to define the purposes of undergraduate education more clearly. Without the framework that a clearly defined set of ends provides, it is very hard to appraise specific proposals for curriculum change: issues of granting credit, setting degree requirements, or determining the length of a college education. Another problem is trying to measure and evaluate the innovations we do introduce. Without evaluation, valuable or trivial innovations survive or fail depending on whether students or professors happen to remain interested in them. A third subject for discussion is the process by which innovation comes about and how to find more effective ways of bringing about needed reform. The fourth problem is how to devise structures for accommodating new ventures in education when they do not fit established organizational lines.

Some of the arguments for the three-year Bachelor's degree, dramatized in the report of the Carnegie Commission *Less Time, More Options*, seems rather curious. As an illustration of my ideas about what is needed in order to innovate effectively, let us study the arguments in the report. One is that because more students are attending

college and because a great many of them are dropping out, a shorter degree program would be preferable. But rather than to assume that a little bit less of the same old thing would solve this problem, we need to develop a very different curriculum—one that acknowledges the fact that the student body at typical new kinds of colleges is made up of a different population with a different set of aspirations than those at the so-called prestige institutions from whose curriculums all too many new colleges adapt their own. Arguments for a three-year degree that cite the fact that more education takes place before college nowadays, and that students mature earlier, and that students are more resistant to the academic grind do not lead logically to the conclusion that a three-year stay in college would benefit the student or would even be acceptable to him. Opinions gathered from students generally show that they prefer a flexible curriculum in which three, four, or five years of undergraduate study could be elected. A very small proportion of the students at Harvard who could have finished in three years has actually taken advantage of the opportunity. The final argument in the report is that because more education takes place throughout life in today's rapidly changing world we should shorten the undergraduate curriculum. But it doesn't necessarily follow that because students need more education during their lifetime they should have less in college.

I think that the reason the above arguments are not very convincing may be that the institutions that are considering three-year degrees are motivated not by educational concerns but by the wish to set the stage for larger tuition increases by reducing the number of years in which a student pays tuition, and the wish to make room within the existing facilities for adding women to the undergraduate student body.

My own interest in the three-year curriculum is to make possible a wider range of experience for the undergraduate by allowing him to spend one of his years not in a classroom but in a variety of other experiences, to bring him into contact with the wider society—whether as a rebel or working within it. If we are honest about what our objectives are and if they have to do with the quality of the learning experience, the college must try to formulate opportunities for that year that will be more valuable than simply another year in the classroom. The college should probably make the three-year degree optional; should include a variety of things dissimilar to what the students have done before, and should search for ways of comparing those who opt for three years with those who choose the traditional four.

I am neither for nor against the three-year degree, but I am for an effort to develop better methodology for understanding the process of educational innovation and curriculum development: an effort to be much clearer about what our objectives are in undergraduate education, to find ways of measuring and evaluating the innovations that we develop, and to study more closely the process of change and the institutional architecture that is needed to make enduring change possible.

Access and Transition

Arland F. Christ-Janer
President, College Entrance Examination Board

The College Board and the institutions represented here have come to talk about change—not about whether change is necessary or whether things will change, but rather about what *kind* of change and about how, where, and when change works. Through its activities, the College Board has some interesting clues about what seems to be happening in education as educational needs and student interests are reflected back against our programs. Our motive in cosponsoring this conference is to share these experiences with you and to encourage increased communication among institutions about some prominent issues of concern to all of us.

Everyone here is deeply involved in the flow of students from secondary school into and through postsecondary education. One of the important facts reflected in Board research and programs is that students are changing in their objectives and goals and in their attitudes about education. The diversity among students who will be seeking meaningful educational experiences in our institutions in the next decade will challenge education to respond flexibly. The real problem faced by educators will be to make opportunity relevant to the needs of individuals who differ greatly in competence, aptitude, interests, and motivation.

Another important lesson we can read back from our experience concerns the impact on students of the enormous amount of information about colleges and careers and the implications of the trend toward providing greater options and greater flexibility by combining study with work, service, and other experiences. Students, challenged to cope with more information and increased options, will have a much greater need for guidance and counseling that focus on informed decision making.

The work of the Commission on Nontraditional Study and the Office of External Degree Plans, cosponsored by the Board and Educational Testing Service, suggests that many of the alternative approaches to education will lead to the introduction of new programs and new arrangements for offering learning, accrediting educational progress, recording and transcribing credits, and awarding degrees. Access to and from both the core (the traditional educational system) and the periphery (those educational activities that take place outside the traditional establishment) will become an important aspect of continuous learning.

The development of these new learning modes suggests an important role for the College Board. The Board must continue to respond to change by providing services that are based on the assumption that there is no magic time or magic system of curricular components that comprise a Bachelor's degree, but rather a whole series of achievement hoops, of steps toward maturity that occur outside as well as inside the classroom. The growing intermittency of education, the transitions back and forth, the combining of part- and full-time study, the process of individualization and diversification of education all call for the Board to be more flexible in perceiving, providing, and delivering services.

You are in charge, we are in charge, education as a whole is in charge. The long-range prospects for opening up higher learning to new approaches seem brighter now than ever before. You are some of the most important institutions of America coming together with ideas about what's happening, about where we ought to be going, and about what we can do to contribute to the enhancement of education. If the Board's experience is laid out on the table, then, together with your own experience, we should have a framework and foundation from which we can build effective solutions to our common problems.

The Conference Deliberations

Albert G. Sims

The participants met in eight simultaneous group sessions lasting most of a day. Each group was assigned a part of the agenda of questions (see Appendix B) so that the whole agenda might be addressed by the participants. As general chairman of the conference, I have prepared the following resume of the discussions from the excellent notes of the graduate students who acted as secretaries for the groups. It is both more and less than a resume – more in that I have shaped a kind of structure representing my perception of the order in the dialog and less in that, in so doing, I have selected rather than summarized. Nevertheless, I have intended to reflect as best I could what these interesting discussions were about.

The central question, most of the conference participants agreed, is: What is the purpose of the Bachelor's degree, and does reasonable consensus exist about the definition of its purpose? If "changing patterns of undergraduate education" are to be weighed, some criterion is desirable as a point of reference. None emerged from the deliberations, and most participants believed that none could or should be derived, given the diversity of students and institutions embraced by the process leading to the degree.

Yet, some argued, the question of purpose cannot be dismissed because it is at the root of the institution's educational function. "If we don't know where we are (in terms of purpose), how can we say where we should be going?" Frequently, it was noted, disparity exists between what a college or university does, what it says it does (and why), and what information is available to students and the public. With growing recognition of the rights and demands of the consumer, an undefinable B.A. program may not be capable of enduring much longer on the strength of its imputed reputation.

With a resilience and verbal proficiency worthy of their profession, participants examined the goals of undergraduate education undeterred by the lack of consensus. One group considered whether, as alternative or supplement to the somewhat meaningless count of "credit hours," students might be assessed with respect to the following qualities or capabilities:

1. competence
2. humaneness or humanitarianism
3. socialization, social awareness, and political responsibility
4. ability to ask the right questions

14

5. ability to manage and execute one's own learning

Such a set of expectations provides a general framework for at least inquiring about current practices in undergraduate education. For example, it was suggested that competence should probably involve as components: mastery of a body of knowledge; project management, or the demonstrated ability to work with ideas, tools, data, and so forth in a relevant area; and experience, or the relating of knowledge to activity by participation. If these components are assumed, the issues are ones of definition, measurement, operational feasibility, standards, and authority. The B.A. degree should represent some level of competence, it was generally agreed, but the components of competence and the related issues are the prior questions.

"Socialization and political responsibility" as well as "humaneness" were also considered critical components in personal development. "Personal development" involves values, and American educators are generally uncomfortable in the presence of "the value question." A grave difficulty, it was noted in one group, is the very real conflict of interests between faculty and students created in most institutions, "where the focus is not on teaching and exemplary behavior and where professors are neither trained nor rewarded primarily for the quality of their teaching or contact with students."

Learning to learn, or the ability to ask and pursue the right questions, is another aspect of the educational function that few felt was being well treated in the undergraduate program. The movement toward more freedom and independence for students in program formulation is tending to display more conspicuously the widespread paucity of institutional resources for competent student counseling and advisement.

Sallies like this at the redoubt of "purpose" in undergraduate education tended to assume, despite Ernest Boyer's speculations of a different character, that the student population with which such education is concerned is the 18-22-year-olds, in the main. But if it is true that education in an institutional sense will become more and more part-time, or cyclical, and for purposes other than the maturation of skills, attitudes, and knowledge among young adults on the threshhold of independence and beginning careers, then one must seriously inquire what pertinence there is to the notion of the B.A. as a "rite of passage" or some denotation of "socialization." And if the four years (or part of that time) spent pursuing the B.A. are for maturation purposes, does the prescription for time and content have equal applicability to the 35-year-old adult who has decided to seek educational

qualifications as a teacher? Indeed, can the B.A. as it is understood (or misunderstood) at present be stretched to cover effectively—without unnecessary pain and cost—the needs of such a student? Or should some other badge of competence be designed for the adult student, reserving the Bachelor's degree as a certification and rite of passage for the educated *young* man and woman? Such questions were briefly recognized in a few groups, but no one, it seemed, cared to dwell on them.

If purpose escapes definition because of diversity in educational enterprise, what is the nature of the diversity and where is it leading? With David Riesman, a number contended that the past decade or two in higher education has been something of a snake dance, with most everyone in line and in step. Real diversity on any scale is an illusion, they seemed to be saying. If purposes are not recognizable, at least the criteria of institutional quality are generally recognizable and aspired to—the value system based on graduate and professional school and, most important, departmental organization. The tenure system is another rugged bulwark against change. The support of both public and private institutions by government funds on an increasing scale is said to be a further gigantic press toward conformity. Our problem, some alleged, is not how to manage rampant change and diversity but rather how to preserve and enlarge these characteristics.

Others took exception to this view. It is true, they acknowledged, that most private residential institutions have entrenched resistance to change. Their clientele tends generally to be the middle class. The costs of such education represent a substantial investment of (mainly) parental funds. The purchaser is interested in a "proved product" that will provide competence, "maturation," and usually a ticket to graduate or professional school. Yet the students in this mix tend to be less traditionally oriented with respect to academic goals—in the race, as someone said, as "a hedge against downward mobility." It is among such students that the disjunction between environment and aspiration is most marked and from whom powerful forces for change have developed.

Among public institutions, they contend, the "new world" of higher education is already to be perceived. Here the minorities and the poor, the sons and daughters of the blue-collar workers, the career women and the career changers, the dropins and dropouts and the part-timers are already appearing in vast numbers through the open doors. Willy-nilly, they are transforming the character of higher education. They are expecting city and state universities to meet them on their

own terms—in some instances, as one participant testified, at the sixth-grade reading level. They are, moreover, expecting to "make it," to get the specific skills and certification necessary for a job and upward mobility. They are generally opposed to innovation that can be perceived as different from (or "cheapening" of) the "real thing" (the traditional degree program). Paradoxically, then, it is mainly among the public institutions that the "new wave" has its impact, causing wide-ranging change to meet the unusual needs of this new population. But it is precisely these students, in their collective predilections, who are averse to innovation.

Much of the new wave of students has its impact on community colleges, which grant the A.A. degree. Some conference participants were skeptical of this relatively new degree, viewing it as an invention of a credential-conscious society unconsciously attempting to buy off the community colleges and their clientele. The inner-city community college is the syndrome of inferior ghetto schooling extended, it was said, and is no solution to the problem of equal access to quality education. Insofar as the new wave spends its force on these institutions, it has no great effect (for change) on the basic character of undergraduate education—and this is the rejoinder of those who call "sweeping change" illusory.

A three-year B.A., endorsed in the Carnegie Commission's report *Less Time, More Options*, is one prospect for change inviting widespread attention. Derek Bok seemed to speak for most participants in his comments on the Commission report. Bok said in effect that the idea had no particular merit perceived simply as a saving of time, or of money, or perchance of facilities to make space for coeducation. Its validity could not be considered apart from its *educational* purpose in the institutional setting. On its educational merits, it might be valid for some institutions or for some students. He pointed out that each year a considerable number of students enter Harvard College with advanced (sophomore) standing, mostly through the College Board's Advanced Placement Program, but most of them opt to take a fourth undergraduate year notwithstanding.

There is nothing sacrosanct about four years, it was acknowledged. It was the norm at a time when students entered college earlier (age 15 or 16) and were generally less well prepared, and then the idea of general and specialized education within the four years became fixed. If the modern B.A. program evolved to fit into and fill a previously existing four-year time span, what, then, is special about 120 credit hours or four years?

17

Most participants asserted that a three-year B.A. was already available in their respective institutions, generally through year-round study (forced pace) or advanced placement (the Advanced Placement Program, the College-Level Examination Program, or institutional credit/placement examinations). Only one institution reported a 90-credit hour requirement. No one contemplated a three-year program other than as some acceleration of pace through the conventional credit-hour requirements. Nor could the participants perceive any press by students for a three-year degree. Scholarship aid is geared to the four-year cycle and so are institutional finances.

If the last two years of high school and the first two years of college were to be considered the general education years, where would the compression of time come to shorten this period? It is frequently alleged that the twelfth year tends to be redundant or that the thirteenth year is repetitious for the abler students. At institutions such as Harvard, it is apparently the fourteenth year that represents for many the "slough of despond." The participants' response to all this was: What we're getting from the high schools in terms of basic skill proficiencies is worse, not better, quality. Said one dean: "We're sending the wrong signals to the secondary schools. They fill up their senior year with sexy small group stuff, and then they come to us and we give them the freshman year of requirements and they hate it." Most admitted that their communications with secondary schools about such matters were scant. One conceded: "They're the innovators, we're the conservatives in the scene we share." If the colleges were to forgo a year (not just accelerate), no one could see how it could be done—or why it should. The following statements reflected common views:

"I've already got flexibility—my need is for much more and better counseling to help students use the flexibility to create their own options. Nothing could be worse than to legislate or bring pressure to bear to finish in three years."

"The shortening of time ought to come in the graduate and professional courses of study. That's where the padding is."

"Time as dimension or function of education is really irrelevant. What we have to be concerned with is content." (Since all formal education is cast firmly on a time frame, this viewpoint requires a special quality of conceptual purity!)

As responsible administrators and policy makers at colleges and universities, the participants seemed more concerned about the effects of change on roles within the community represented by the in-

18

stitution. In particular, the tension between structure and freedom in the movement toward more student options and decision making was perceived as a problem with significant implications for students, faculty, and administration. Some thought that institutions had already gone too far in this direction and had failed in the exercise of their responsibility. "Education is our business. Our judgment is best in certain respects. We must have the fiber to exercise that judgment." Moreover, it was asserted, most students are looking for the security and order that structure provides. "This is the only time in one's life," commented a participant, "when there is an opportunity to approach a body of knowledge systematically. If we throw this away, we produce nothing but dilettantes."

Reflections of this point of view came in the form of several observations:

less than 10 percent of the students at one institution given the freedom to create their own programs exercised the option – usually a small minority and those who were most able academically;

student-originated "house" courses on ecology, violence, and so forth at another institution tended to last only as long as the organizers remained on the scene;

students given freedom from distribution requirements and prerequisites tended to form course selection patterns much as they did before the requirements were dropped (an impression thought to be worth College Board documentation and research).

Of the need for structure there can be little doubt. The question is: Whose structure, how is it derived, and what is the congruence, if any, between student and institutional concepts of structure? Some believed that structure came from the institution and its philosophy of education. Others saw structure as the fabric of the individual academic disciplines. Still others viewed it as something that emerged in the mind of the knower (learner). But this latter view leads to the observation that the minds of students and faculty are not "mutually engaged." It was suggested that cognitive experience and organization of the two groups are markedly different. The academic discipline is, in a sense, a false separating-off from other ways of knowing and largely misses the world of problems perceived by the student to be real. The disjunction in structure comes from the academic world's failure to address the world the student knows and to say something that helps the student clarify, criticize, or construct it differently.

When institutions enlarge the degree of student freedom (as in the relaxation of course and distribution requirements, the establishment

of periods or options for independent study, and so forth) the institutional obligation concomitantly and almost invariably grows. The simplest institutional task is typified by the regulated and prescriptive institutional environment. The most difficult is the environment of individual freedom, choice, and learning *based on pertinent information and opportunities created and communicated by the institution.* In enlarging student freedom, colleges and universities have tended to fail in the assumption of their corresponding obligations to communicate pertinent information and opportunities to students.

The typical distribution requirements of a college, for example, have been in effect generalized advisement to students about how the resources of the institution should be used relative to certain curricular choices. The form of this advisement, being generalized, was not as good potentially as individual counsel about how the student might use the institution's resources in his best interests. But it was surely better than nothing, and it provided some structure. Now if the institution is to waive distribution requirements, it faces the infinitely more difficult task of delineating itself to each student so that he can make maximal use of its resources. Regrettably, this calls for a kind of individualized institutional response for which, in most universities, there is simply no capability. The faculty are specialized and usually uninterested in student counseling. Counseling, in sad repair in the secondary schools, is virtually nonexistent as a professional service at the collegiate level. Even if it were in existence, somehow institutions would have to develop the capability (which in conscience they should have) of interacting one-to-one with their student populations in the all-important task of planning the student's educational experience.

So it is also with independent study and work experience. Most of the institutions represented are experimenting with these and other ways of enriching the learning experience. But always the institutional (faculty and administrative) responsibility in the circumstances is made heavier, not lighter, as a result. The connection to be established between "experience" and "education," or more particularly credit, is especially troublesome. "In my university [urban]," said one, "75 percent of my students are already working. Shall I tell them it's their urban experience and have the sociology department stamp 20 hours of credit on it?"

The notion that perspectives and constructs formed on the academic turf might be illuminated, enriched, and evaluated by experience in the "real world" seems the stuff out of which valid connectives between study and experience might be built. Most institutions appear

20

to be groping indecisively with the problem. Should credit be given? How much? How should the experience be delimited? What are the mechanics for validating the experience? If such opportunities are to be systematically available as a part of the university's offered learning experience, the university will have to seek and negotiate opportunities for students with government, business, and community agencies on a broad scale. This would be a new role for most institutions. Their only general precedent, that of the practicum for teacher trainees, is not comparable in complexity and diversity to the problem of identifying laboratories for a social sciences student.

The problem with the adult student entering or reentering the university and seeking credit for experience is essentially the same, although the study–experience sequence is typically reversed from that of the inexperienced student. The integrity of the present academic system requires that such experience be made to infuse the process of study and conceptualization to the point of competence recognizable for credit. Only the particular institution and faculty, interacting with the student, can engineer and evaluate such a fusion. That it deserves to be done is a matter of simple equity.

Interdisciplinary programs are another important response to the demand that the university's knowledge packaging be more sensibly related to the student's perception of his world. Such programs are available at many of the institutions represented. The task of the college administrator is to help create a climate in which interdisciplinary studies can develop. They cannot be successfully "legislated," most participants felt. Rather, programs were most productive when individual faculty members took the initiative for a particular interdisciplinary course; and these offerings usually remained attractive only as long as the faculty participating retained their initiative and enthusiasm.

The assault on traditional grading systems can be read as another sign of tension and role change within the collegiate community. Some people at the conference saw widely prevalent grade inflation as, in part, a reflection of the growing competition between faculties for students and for survival (competition enhanced by the trend away from the distribution requirements that previously protected demand at certain levels). Others viewed the "subversion" of the grading system as principally the result of attitudes common among students and younger faculty, who consider the present system as frustrating a meaningful educational process. The measurement of achievement and competence could be left to those outside the college

who receive and employ its products, but few were prepared to accept this prospect. On the other hand, it was conceded, if an evaluation system is to have plausible meaning, it should denote some describable degree of competence. This, clearly, the present system does not do, since it is based on credit hours and somewhat unconnected pieces of knowledge. An examination system unrelated to credit hours and tied to denotable levels of competence in a subject area or field might be an alternative, but one that would be counter to heavily entrenched institutional practices.

Pervading almost all of this discussion, at times spoken and otherwise clearly implicit, was the specter of money. Innovation and change are usually reckoned in greater costs at a time when the price of education is already driving needed consumers out of the marketplace. Yet without change and search for individuality in institutional character, the threat to survival for many private institutions seems heightened. In public institutions, especially, the external demands for efficiency are becoming manifest in the form of required minimum teaching loads and sporadic attacks on the tenure system. Once again the college administrator mediates between the members of the collegiate community, notably the faculty, with their vested rights and privileges, and the sometimes conflicting demands and expectations of the larger community. There is, it appears, scarcely any sanctuary left in education from public accountability.

With candor the participants acknowledged the particularity of their point of view in these deliberations on undergraduate education. As senior administrators—academic vice presidents, provosts, deans, and a few presidents—they are in general men and women of long and diverse experience in higher education. They have been through the "wars" of the 1960s in academe, and most were in harness before that decade. They have come to know change, even as ground out in social conflict, and the necessity for change. They are not apologetic for the condition of higher education as they view it; indeed, they believe in it and its accomplishments. In general, and in comparison with junior faculty and some students (by no means all, they would contend), they are conservative—constructively conservative, they would say. Many have a sense that their past weakness (individually and as institutions) was that they permitted others less competent to preempt decision making for change. They intend that this should not continue to happen, and they sense that the times are ripe for strong leadership. However, the societal interests being vested in higher education are now so immense and complex that basic policies shaping institu-

tions and their relationships with students may in fundamental respects be beyond regulation or control by institutional administrators. The issue of who has responsibility and, more important, the leadership initiative, is nevertheless guaranteed to be a continuing contest on a moving battleground. The participants at this conference had some different views on institutional responsibility but, in general, a common understanding of the ramparts to be defended.

23

Appendix A.
Conference Participants

Alec P. Alexander, Dean, College of Letters and Science, University of California at Santa Barbara
Robert G. Arns, Vice Provost for Arts and Sciences, Ohio State University
James H. Baker, Vice President for Public Affairs, College Entrance Examination Board
Allen B. Ballard, Dean for Academic Development, City University of New York
Edgar Beckham, Associate Provost, Wesleyan University (Conn.)
Julius C. Bernstein, Superintendent of Schools, Livingston, New Jersey
E. G. Bogue, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Memphis State University
Derek C. Bok, President, Harvard University
Ernest L. Boyer, Chancellor, State University of New York at Albany
Louis F. Brakeman, Dean of the College, Denison University
LeRoy C. Breunig, Dean of the Faculty, Barnard College
Carroll W. Brewster, Dean of the College, Dartmouth College
Donald R. Brown, Assistant Provost, Purdue University
Jessie L. Brown, Director of the Communication Center, Hampton Institute
Stuart M. Brown Jr., Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Hawaii
William Miller Burke, Assistant Provost, University of Notre Dame
John E. Cantelon, Vice President, Undergraduate Studies, University of Southern California
Robert S. Chase Jr., Provost and Dean of Faculty, Lafayette College
O. L. Chavarria-Aguilar, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Science, City College of The City University of New York
Jack R. Childress, Vice President, Central, College Entrance Examination Board
Mark N. Christensen, Vice Chancellor, University of California at Berkeley
Arland F. Christ-Janer, President, College Entrance Examination Board
Frederic N. Cleaveland, Provost, Duke University
Jewel Plummer Cobb, Dean of the College, Connecticut College

24

Thomas S. Colahan, Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University of New York College of Arts and Science at Geneseo
Lawson Crowe, Provost and Vice President for Research, University of Colorado
Richard W. Day, Principal, Phillips Exeter Academy
A. Graham Down, Acting Director, Advanced Placement Program, College Entrance Examination Board
George A. Drake, Dean of the College, Colorado College
Reverend John M. Driscoll, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Villanova University
E. Alden Dunham, Executive Associate, Carnegie Corporation of New York
Robert E. Dunham, Vice President for Undergraduate Studies, Pennsylvania State University
Sherwood Dunham, Vice President and Dean of Faculties, State University of New York College of Arts and Science at Oswego
John T. Dunlop, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University
Archie R. Dykes, Chancellor, University of Tennessee
Alan D. Entine, Assistant Academic Vice President, State University of New York at Stony Brook
Reverend Thomas R. Fitzgerald, SJ, Academic Vice President, Georgetown University
Gerhard G. Friedrich, Dean, Academic Planning, California State University and Colleges
William Gescheider, Director of the Planning, Evaluation, and Report Staff, United States Office of Education
James L. Gibbs, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Stanford University
Charles E. Gilbert, Provost, Swarthmore College
Paul R. Givens, Director, Institutional Research and Planning, Ithaca College
Oakley J. Gordon, Dean of General Education and Academic Counseling, University of Utah
Neil R. Grabois, Dean of the College, Williams College
William R. Grogan, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Carl H. Haag, Program Director, Placement Tests, Educational Testing Service
Vincent H. Haag, Senior Member of Curriculum Committee, Franklin and Marshall College

Harold P. Hanson, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Florida
David A. Harnett, Secretary of the Faculty and Director of Advanced Standing in Harvard College, Harvard University
George R. Healy, Vice President for Academic Affairs, College of William and Mary
Nicholas Hobbs, Provost, Vanderbilt University
Helmut P. Hofmann, Academic Vice President, Weber State College
James R. Hooper, Dean, Special Undergraduate Studies, Case Western Reserve University
Carl F. Hovde, Dean of the College, Columbia College of Columbia University
Glenn W. Howard, Dean of Administration, Queens College of The City University of New York
I. Moyer Hunsberger, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, State University of New York at Albany
Stanley J. Idzerda, President, College of St. Benedict
Arthur F. Jackson, Dean, School of Arts and Sciences, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
Paul G. Jenson, Dean of Faculty, Colby College
John J. Karakash, Dean, College of Engineering, Lehigh University
Roger E. Kasperson, Dean of the College, Clark University
Robert J. Kates Jr., Director of the New England Regional Office, College Entrance Examination Board
Gail Kelly, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Reed College
Stuart E. Knapp, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Oregon State University
Robert O. Lawton, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Florida State University
Martin Lichterman, Dean of Faculty, Union College (New York)
Edward A. Lindell, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Denver
H. David Lipsich, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, University of Cincinnati
William F. Lye, Head of the Department of History and Geography, Utah State University
Raymond W. Mack, Vice President and Dean of Faculties, Northwestern University
Leslie F. Malpass, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

26

Richard A. Matre, Vice President and Dean of Faculties, Loyola University
Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld, Associate Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs, Brown University
Douglas Maynard, Vice President and Provost, Hunter College of The City University of New York
Lee C. McDonald, Dean of the College, Pomona College
Michael V. McEnany, Dean of Undergraduate Affairs, Rice University
William P. McEwen, Provost and Dean of Faculties, Hofstra University
H. Neill McFarland, Vice President and Provost, Southern Methodist University
William S. McFeely, Dean of the Faculty, Mount Holyoke College
Nan E. McGehee, Associate Dean of Faculties, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
T. E. McKinney Jr., Director, Division of Institutional Services, United Negro College Fund
Louis L. McQuitty, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, University of Miami
Bruce Morgan, Dean of the College – Designate, Carleton College
George S. Mumford, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Tufts University
Charles O. Neidt, Academic Vice President, Colorado State University
John K. Nelson, Associate Dean of the General College, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
James Newcomer, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Texas Christian University
Arthur J. Noetzel, Academic Vice President, John Carroll University
Edwin P. Nye, Dean of the Faculty, Trinity College (Connecticut)
O. William Perlmutter, Graduate School of Public Affairs, State University of New York at Albany
Ewell J. Reagin, Associate Dean of Faculty, Antioch College
Nathaniel Reed, Assistant Dean, Amherst College
Donald R. Reich, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Oberlin College
Paul J. Reiss, Academic Vice President, Fordham University
Robert W. Ritchie, Vice Provost for Academic Administration, University of Washington
Miriam B. Rock, Assistant Dean for Student Programs, University of Rochester
Robert W. Rogers, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign Campus

27

Neil L. Rudenstine, Dean of the College – Designate, Princeton University
Ambrose Saricks, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Kansas
David S. Saxon, Executive Vice Chancellor, University of California at Los Angeles
Philip B. Secor, Dean of the College, Muhlenberg College
Irwin Shainman, Dean of the Faculty – Designate, Williams College
David A. Shannon, Vice President and Provost, University of Virginia
J. Thomas Shaw, Chairman of the Standing Curriculum Committee, University of Wisconsin at Madison
James W. Shaw, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Massachusetts at Amherst
Robert Sherman, Associate Dean of Studies, Miami University
John W. Shirley, Provost and Vice President, University of Delaware
Robert E. Shoenberg, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University of New York College of Arts and Science at Buffalo
Barry N. Siegel, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, College of Liberal Arts, University of Oregon
Adele Simmons, Dean, Jackson College of Tufts University
Albert G. Sims, Vice President for Programs, College Entrance Examination Board
Wendell I. Smith, Provost, Bucknell University
Allen P. Splete, Vice President for Academic Planning, St. Lawrence University
Martin Stearns, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Wayne State University
Erwin R. Steinberg, Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Carnegie-Mellon University
John Summerskill, Vice President for College Board Programs, Educational Testing Service
Donald C. Swain, Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies, University of California at Davis
Bruce Thomas, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the University, Trinity University (Texas)
Robert K. Thomas, Academic Vice President, Brigham Young University
Humphrey Tonkin, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, University of Pennsylvania
Leo Treitler, Dean of the College, Brandeis University

Lothar L. Tresp, Director, Programs for Superior Students, University of Georgia
A. Richard Turner, Dean of the Faculty, Middlebury College
Marvin Wachman, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Temple University
Margaret A. Waggoner, Dean of the College, Smith College
Franklin W. Wallin, Provost and Dean of the Faculty, Colgate University
William J. Watt, Dean of the College, Washington and Lee University
Barbara Wells, Dean of the Faculty – Elect, Vassar College
Burton M. Wheeler, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Washington University
Donald White, Associate Dean of Faculties, Boston College
Dean K. Whitla, Professor of Education and Director of the Office of Tests, Harvard University
Charles P. Whitlock, Dean of Harvard College, Harvard University
Stephen E. Wiberley, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
John A. Wilkinson, Associate Dean of Yale College, Yale University
Edwin G. Wilson, Provost, Wake Forest University
Henry R. Winkler, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Rutgers University – The State University of New Jersey
Clifford L. Winters Jr., Assistant Chancellor, Syracuse University
Peter D. Wood, Assistant Director for Arts and Humanities, Rockefeller Foundation
Stephen J. Wright, Vice President, East, and Director of Upper Division Scholarship Program, College Entrance Examination Board

29

Appendix B.
Questions for Discussion

The following questions were presented to the discussion groups for consideration at their several separate meetings. Each group was assigned a part of the questions, so that some groups discussed several.

1. Is there a reasonable consensus about the four-year degree? If not, is one needed?
   A. With respect to academic achievement?
   B. With respect to vocational or professional preparation?
   C. With respect to responsible functional behavior in the society?
2. What kind of flexibility with respect to the time (chronology) of education should be offered in undergraduate education?
   A. Deferred admission?
   B. A three-year program?
   C. A drop-in, drop-out, drop-in accommodation?
   D. Individual pacing toward the bachelor's degree?
3. What kind of flexibility with respect to the place (site) of education should characterize undergraduate education programs?
   A. Off-campus, independent study? How much, when, and under what supervision, if any?
   B. Credit by examination? Under what conditions and standards? How should the residence requirement relate to credit?
4. What options are pertinent and possible with respect to variations from the traditional content or process in higher education?
   A. Should experience in some extramural form be a possible or integral part of the undergraduate program? How measured and accredited?
   B. Should "general education" become a responsibility of the high school, leaving the college the task of professional and specialized studies?
   C. What is the educational significance of the tendency toward relaxing course and distribution requirements? Freedom for what?
   D. Is the more extensive development of interdisciplinary studies desirable? Feasible?
5. What responsibility do undergraduate institutions have for individualization of the educational experience?

30

A. How much individualization is manageable from the institutional viewpoint? For the academically able? For the academically disadvantaged? For all?
B. How much responsibility does the institution have for taking (admitting) the serious student from where he is in terms of educational achievement? Is there a special obligation to "individualize" education for students from minority groups or academically disadvantaged students?
C. Is the "contractual arrangement" between student and institution in the interests of both parties?
D. What participation should students have in curriculum planning or innovation and the teaching process?

6. What constraints or opportunities arise from external influences or pressures on the undergraduate colleges?
   A. What are the consequences of increasing public financing of both public and private institutions?
   B. How does the fiscal crisis in higher education affect the motivation and capability for change in undergraduate education?
   C. To what extent does competition force the search for distinctive roles or character among undergraduate institutions and how does this affect "flexibilities"?
   D. How does the public policy inclination toward "universal higher education" affect the style and capabilities of types of institutions?
   E. How does the existence of two-year colleges affect the four-year colleges – do they represent constraints of opportunities with respect to freedom of action?
   F. To what extent do the nature and expectations of graduate and professional schools describe limits for innovation in the undergraduate colleges?
   G. Do business, industry, and the public expect of higher education, among other things, a withholding function – that is, a containment of labor from the market – and, if so, does this substantially affect "less time, more options"?
7. Do we have sufficient information – an adequate data base – to make wise decisions or judgments about these questions? If not, what additional data do we need and how should we get it?
8. How do you think the College Board with its membership of schools, colleges, and universities and its various services might make

greater contributions to institutions coping with the problems of undergraduate institutions being discussed here?

Discussion Groups

Group I:
Gerhard G. Friedrich, *Chairman*
Paul G. Jenson, *Recorder*
Susan W. Lewis, *Secretary*, Student, Harvard University Graduate School

Group II:
James L. Gibbs, *Chairman*
John K. Nelson, *Recorder*
Dale K. Birkel, *Secretary*, Student, Harvard University Graduate School

Group III:
Oakley J. Gordon, *Chairman*
Nan E. McGehee, *Recorder*
Kristi B. Moore, *Secretary*, Student, Harvard University Graduate School

Group IV:
Stanley J. Idzerda, *Chairman*
Ewell J. Reagin, *Recorder*
David M. Hersey, *Secretary*, Student, Harvard University Graduate School

Group V:
Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld, *Chairman*
Burton M. Wheeler, *Recorder*
John Kimball Kehoe, *Secretary*, Student, Harvard University Graduate School

Group VI:
Michael V. McEnany, *Chairman*
James R. Hooper, *Recorder*
Maureen A. Malin, *Secretary*, Student, Harvard University Graduate School

Group VII:
Irwin Shainman, *Chairman*
Reverend Thomas R. Fitzgerald, SJ, *Recorder*
Patrick J. Dolan, *Secretary*, Student, Harvard University Graduate School

Group VIII:
Henry R. Winkler, *Chairman*
Jewel Plummer Cobb, *Recorder*
Nancy S. Lindsay, *Secretary*, Student, Harvard University Graduate School

Appendix C.
Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

Dean K. Whitla

The following questionnaire, developed by David A. Harnett, Director of Advanced Standing in Harvard College, was distributed before the conference to all registrants. Edited and analyzed by Dean K. Whitla, Director of the Office of Tests, at Harvard, it provides an invaluable guide to the attitudes of participants as they relate to the many issues encompassed by the agenda of the conference. Although the quantity of specific information presented here may seem overwhelming, several trends are apparent:

The tenor of the times has brought about a remarkable degree of flexibility in university requirements and programs, along with a wide acceptance of testing programs as a basis of credentialing. Students can now weave their way through the labyrinth of academia and find much more concern and accommodation for their interests than they would have in the past. There are still small pockets of resistance, a few of which are universal (for example, lack of special privileges for spouses) and others that are less widespread (for example, not granting credit for Advanced Placement Examinations), but overall the changes have been enormous.

- These changes that now seem so prevalent are primarily structural. Although there are hints of change in the areas of academic disciplines and teaching (for example, new majors and interest in improving instruction), these are few compared with the new flexibility about requirements and bases of granting credit.
- In this period of search for ways to make college available to a larger segment of the population, to change form and structure, and even to improve the quality of life of students there has been relatively little public thought or concern about the quality of education.

The response rate for the questionnaire was 76.1 percent, a high return, especially since the completed forms had to be returned during a two-week period just preceding the conference. Whatever limitations there may be to this questionnaire, the questions seem to have been answerable and to have induced a willingness to respond. For most questions the figure given is the *percent* of "yes" answers in the total number of answers.

Questionnaire

1. Do you *have* a three-year degree program?
   a. open to everyone . . . . . *Public:* 26. *Private:* 22. *All:* 24
   b. a privilege which can be earned by passing locally prepared examinations . . . . . *Public:* 16. *Private:* 9. *All:* 12
   c. for students entering with Advanced Placement credit. . . *Public:* 36. *Private:* 37. *All:* 37
   d. for students with strong foreign credentials . . . *Public:* 10. *Private:* 13. *All:* 10
   e. for transfer students. . . . . *Public:* 19. *Private:* 24. *All:* 19
2. Are you *contemplating* a three-year program?
   a. open to everyone . . . . . *Public:* 23. *Private:* 24. *All:* 24
   b. a privilege which can be earned by passing locally prepared examinations . . . . . *Public:* 19. *Private:* 20. *All:* 20
   c. for students entering with Advanced Placement credit. . . *Public:* 16. *Private:* 19. *All:* 18
   d. for students with strong foreign credentials . . . *Public:* 7. *Private:* 7. *All:* 7
   e. for transfer students. . . . . *Public:* 13. *Private:* 9. *All:* 11

   1-2. The Carnegie Commission's report *Less Time, More Options* has already accomplished its task at 43 percent of the institutions represented at the conference, for these have operating three-year programs. It is surprising, however, that only 37 percent make a three-year degree available to students who have taken Advanced Placement Examinations, although another 18 percent contemplate doing so. If these colleges are as amenable to flexibility in programing as they would appear in other portions of this questionnaire, their constraint here is surprising, especially considering the wide success of AP students. It would seem appropriate for the remaining 45 percent that have no three-year option to reexamine their programs. The same point could well be made with those colleges that do not accept students with strong foreign credentials.
3. Are students interested in a three-year degree program?
   a. yes, many . . . . . *Public:* 19. *Private:* 17. *All:* 18
   b. yes, a few . . . . . *Public:* 52. *Private:* 72. *All:* 65
   c. essentially none. . . . . *Public:* 10. *Private:* 6. *All:* 9

35

3. Only a few students appear to be interested. Evidence from AP programs corroborates these responses, for the number of students choosing the three-year option where it has been available is small.

4. College credit normally is granted for:
   a. Advanced Placement Examinations . . . . . *Public:* yes 100, no 0
      Private: yes 94, no 6. *All:* yes 96, no 4
   b. College-Level Examination Program examinations . . . . . *Public:* yes 77, no 23
      Private: yes 39, no 61. *All:* yes 53, no 47
   c. the American College Test . . . . . *Public:* yes 3, no 97
      Private: yes 9, no 91. *All:* yes 7, no 93
   d. College Board's Achievement Tests . . . *Public:* yes 19, no 81
      Private: yes 25, no 75. *All:* yes 23, no 77
   e. state-set examinations . *Public:* yes 3, no 97
      Private: yes 7, no 93. *All:* yes 6, no 94
   f. locally prepared examinations taken at the time of matriculation. . *Public:* yes 65, no 35
      Private: yes 38, no 62. *All:* yes 48, no 52
   g. Credit is given to anyone sitting for final examination in courses whether they have been enrolled in the course or not.
      Public: yes 19, no 81
      Private: yes 11, no 89. *All:* yes 14, no 86

   4. The data here suggest that AP examinations are widely acceptable for credit, even though such a small percentage of the colleges offer a three-year program for AP students. CLEP has in its first few years become more widely accepted than rumor would have led one to believe; 53 percent is a high acceptance rate for a new program in a group of leading universities (48 percent also accept results of locally prepared examinations—a nice alternative). A greater percentage of public institutions accepted CLEP (public 77 percent, private 39 percent) and locally prepared tests (65 percent versus 38 percent) than private institutions did.

5. College credit for study done elsewhere is granted for:
   a. study completed before admission (transfer students) . . . *Public:* yes 100, no 0
      Private: yes 97, no 3. *All:* yes 98, no 2

b. selected and identified programs only . . . . . *Public:* yes 23, no 77
Private: yes 24, no 76. *All:* yes 24, no 76

c. summer school at other institutions . . . *Public:* yes 100, no 0
Private: yes 94, no 6. *All:* yes 97, no 3

d. junior year abroad programs . . . . . *Public:* yes 94, no 6
Private: yes 98, no 2. *All:* yes 96, no 4

e. for any full academic year of work completed elsewhere . . *Public:* yes 68, no 32
Private: yes 70, no 30. *All:* yes 69, no 31

f. projects and work done off the campus . . . . . *Public:* yes 65, no 35
Private. yes 66, no 34. *All:* yes 65, no 35

5. Transfer credit, summer school credit, and junior year abroad programs are almost universally accepted. Acceptance of credit for academic study elsewhere and for off-campus projects, especially the latter, points up a marked change in the traditional faculty attitude that work worthy of credit must be done under its own tutelage.

6. On what authority is credit policy determined?
   a. faculty-wide . . . . . *Public:* 71. *Private:* 49. *All:* 57
   b. departmental . . . . . *Public:* 42. *Private:* 43. *All:* 42
   c. other, please specify. . . . . *Public:* 26. *Private:* 35. *All:* 32

7. Criteria for credit reflect:
   a. individual grade performance. . . . . *Public:* yes 87, no 13
   Private: yes 87, no 13. *All:* yes 87, no 13

   b. evaluation of a student's entire record. . . . . *Public:* yes 45, no 55
   Private: yes 45, no 55. *All:* yes 45, no 55

   c. the type of previous institution attended – accredited, in-state, and so forth . . *Public:* yes 90, no 10
   Private: yes 94, no 6. *All:* yes 93, no 7

   d. matching previous courses as equivalents to your courses. . . . . *Public:* yes 90, no 10
   Private: yes 78, no 22. *All:* yes 83, no 17

e. individual faculty judgments in relation to previous nontraditional study . . *Public:* yes 42, no 58
Private: yes 57, no 43. *All:* yes 52, no 48

8. Is the number of transfer students admitted determined by constraints of space and faculty or by the number and quality of applicants?
   a. number limited primarily by space . . . . . *Public:* 52. *Private:* 50. *All:* 51
   b. number limited primarily by quality. . . . . *Public:* 58. *Private:* 61. *All:* 60

8. Clearly, with 111 percent, this question got the best response rate! Seriously, a number of people rationally enough checked both alternatives, for in fact they are not mutually exclusive. Quality is given oftener than space as a reason to limit the number of transfers admitted.

9. What percentage of undergraduate transfers, on the average, do you accept in the following categories?

	Public							*Private*						
Percent of transfers	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	0	10	20	30	40	50	60
Percent of "yes" answers:														
a. second-term freshmen .	50	33	4	4	4		4	70	15	2	2	7		
b. first-term sophomores. .	45	21	21	12	4	13	4	52	4	8	11	8	16	2
c. second-term sophomores	46	25	13	13	4			67	8	11	5	6	4	
d. first-term juniors	25	13	17	4	4	17	20	52	2	9	8	9	7	14
e. second-term juniors. . .	54	21	17	8				78	10	9	4			
f. first-term seniors	67	25	7	1				79	19	3				
	All													
a. second-term freshmen .	73	14	7	7										
b. first-term sophomores. .	61	16	5	8	7	10								
c. second-term sophomores	71	14	6	3	4	2	1							
d. first-term juniors	61	5	6	8	8	7	6							
e. second-term juniors. . .	78	13	7	2										
f. first-term seniors	79	19	2	1										

9. A lion's share of transfers enroll in their second college for the sophomore year or the beginning of the junior year. But with student mobility increasing, entry points have proliferated; one college reported it admits 30 percent of its transfers as first-term seniors. I'm sure many colleges feel there is a meaningful, beneficial sequence to requirements, general examinations, and thesis

which would be disrupted by taking a single final year at a new college; but if our data here are evidence that students can successfully transfer at different points in their college careers, some schools may want to consider relaxing their transfer policies.

10. Do you give credit toward the degree for:
    a. foreign national school-leaving examinations that represent more than 12 years of schooling . . *Public:* yes 65, no 35 *Private:* yes 55, no 45. *All:* yes 58, no 42
    b. the International Baccalaureate . . . . . *Public:* yes 26, no 74 *Private:* yes 37, no 63. *All:* yes 33, no 67

    10. As mentioned earlier, the restrictions on foreign credentials seem unduly tight. Both school-leaving examinations and the International Baccalaureate are tests that can show a level of education at least equal to that completed during the normal college freshman year.

11. Rationale for granting course credit for work done elsewhere:
    a. Study at sister institutions is acceptable to our faculty. . . . . *Public:* 100. *Private:* 93. *All:* 95
    b. Student work experiences are as qualitatively good an educational experience as course work. . . . . *Public:* 13. *Private:* 15. *All:* 14
    c. College credit has been an artificially narrow concept which needs broadening. . . . . *Public:* 26. *Private:* 26. *All:* 26
    d. This is one effective way of making college experience more "relevant." . . . . . *Public:* 10. *Private:* 15. *All:* 13

12. Upon reflection about your procedures for giving credit for work done elsewhere or by examination would you appraise it as:
    a. an excellent plan – recommend it highly . . . . . *Public:* 7. *Private:* 11. *All:* 9
    b. a plan with which you are satisfied. . . . . *Public:* 48. *Private:* 33. *All:* 39
    c. so-so . . . . . *Public:* 36. *Private:* 43. *All:* 40
    d. an unsatisfactory plan . . . . . *Public:* 7. *Private:* 13. *All:* 11
    e. a disaster area . . . . . *Public:* 0. *Private:* 0. *All:* 0

    12. A further examination of the questionnaires, to determine which colleges were highly satisfied with their procedures for granting credit, shows that they fall into two camps: the very

39

liberal, who grant credit for almost every activity that might even be considered as a basis for college credit (this was the larger of the two groups), and the more conservative, who grant credit only for "special cases," as they phrased it – none of which has occurred in the last few years. Most colleges that claim to be making individual decisions on credit, accepting some requests while denying others, appear to be struggling with their basis of evaluation and are not as satisfied with their procedures.

13. Do you give credit for individual work or individual study?
    a. when supervised by the faculty. *Public:* 100. *Private:* 98. *All:* 99
    b. when not supervised by the faculty . . . . . *Public:* 13. *Private:* 7. *All:* 9
    c. when in a student's major . . . *Public:* 81. *Private:* 93. *All:* 88
    d. when outside the major . . . . *Public:* 71. *Private:* 87. *All:* 81
    e. when away from the campus . . *Public:* 71. *Private:* 91. *All:* 83
    f. when on campus . . . . . *Public:* 87. *Private:* 93. *All:* 91
    g. up to 10 percent of the credit required for the degree. . . . . *Public:* 16. *Private:* 25. *All:* 22
    h. up to 25 percent of the credit required for the degree. . . . . *Public:* 29. *Private:* 19. *All:* 22
    i. more than 25 percent of the credit required for the degree. . . . . *Public:* 13. *Private:* 11. *All:* 12

    13. Unsupervised individual study is not widely acceptable; however, almost all other variations on the theme are. The extent of this trend is documented by the fact that 12 percent of the colleges permit more than 25 percent of the degree credits to consist of independent work. Public colleges were more likely than private to give up to 25 percent credit (29 percent versus 19 percent).

14. Do you anticipate any changes in giving credit?
    a. liberalize your policies . . . . . *Public:* 55. *Private:* 54. *All:* 54
    b. anticipate no changes . . . . . *Public:* 32. *Private:* 28. *All:* 29
    c. plan to restructure the operation *Public:* 26. *Private:* 17. *All:* 20
    d. probably tighten the regulations. *Public:* 7. *Private:* 2. *All:* 3

    14. Tendencies toward liberalization of the crediting procedures appear unabated: Box score: radicals 54, conservatives 3.

15. Do you permit students to generate their own majors?
    a. yes, frequently . . . . . *Public:* 13. *Private:* 26. *All:* 21
    b. yes, occasionally . . . . . *Public:* 48. *Private:* 54. *All:* 52
    c. no . . . . . *Public:* 39. *Private:* 20. *All:* 27

40

15. The faculty, while recognizing students' initiative, still retains the privilege of making decisions in their academic disciplines. Private colleges are more likely than public colleges frequently to let students create their own majors (26 percent versus 13 percent).

16. Is there a mechanism whereby students can initiate new courses?
    a. yes, quite easily . . . . . *Public:* 10. *Private:* 15. *All:* 12
    b. yes, if they can obtain faculty support . . . . . *Public:* 71. *Private:* 69. *All:* 65
    c. yes, there is a mechanism but it's by and large disfunctional. . . . *Public:* 13. *Private:* 5. *All:* 8
    d. no, course initiation is a faculty prerogative . . . . . *Public:* 13. *Private:* 19. *All:* 15

    16. Referring to questions 12 and 14 above: Student initiation of courses, however, is another ball game: radicals 12, conservatives 15.

17. Do you permit undergraduates to offer instruction to other undergraduates?
    a. Yes, some courses are conducted by students. . . . . *Public:* 29. *Private:* 2. *All:* 28
    b. Undergraduates are used as section leaders and laboratory assistants.. . . . *Public:* 58. *Private:* 56. *All:* 57
    c. Undergraduates serve as graders in some courses.. . . . . *Public:* 52. *Private:* 48. *All:* 49
    d. Undergraduates serve as tutors in remedial and self-paced courses. . . . . *Public:* 55. *Private:* 54. *All:* 54
    e. None of the above; all instruction by undergraduates is informal and not for credit. . . . *Public:* 7. *Private:* 13. *All:* 11

    17. It would be useful to have earlier surveys on such questions as these. Instinctively, one feels that when 28 percent of these institutions permit students to conduct their own courses, a high-water mark has been reached. In sharp contrast, only half of the colleges give students the far smaller responsibility, as far as academic content and standards are concerned, of serving as section heads, tutors, and graders.

18. What do students find to be the most attractive of your current "standard" majors, for example, history, English, biology?
    In decreasing order of frequency, psychology, English, history, biology, government, sociology, and fine arts are the most popular of the traditional majors.

41

19. What do students find to be the most attractive of your new or nontraditional majors, for example, human biology, Afro studies, ecology?
    In decreasing order of frequency, urban studies, ecology, ethnic studies, individual majors, and American studies are the most popular of the new concentrations.

20. Do you have available an Associate of Arts degree. . . . . *Public:* yes 26, no 74
    Private: yes 8, no 92. *All:* yes 14, no 86

21. Do you otherwise provide for nondegree study? If so, please specify.. . . . *Public:* yes 84, no 16
    Private: yes 67, no 33. *All:* yes 73, no 27

22. Do you have any special arrangements with other colleges or junior colleges for students to enroll in undergraduate courses at your institution? . . . . *Public:* yes 65, no 35
    Private: yes 76, no 24. *All:* yes 72, no 28

23. Do you have a cooperative work-study program? . . . *Public:* yes 55, no 45
    Private: yes 23, no 77. *All:* yes 34, no 66

    21, 22, 23. The breadth of programs offered by this group of institutions is impressive.

24. Is "continuing education" an idea of interest for your school?
    a. We have long been active. . . . . *Public:* 74. *Private:* 32. *All:* 47
    b. Our programs are expanding. . . *Public:* 42. *Private:* 30. *All:* 34
    c. We have plans but as yet the program is small. . . . . *Public:* 7. *Private:* 26. *All:* 19
    d. This is not something on our agenda at the moment. . . . . *Public:* 3. *Private:* 26. *All:* 18

    24. Public institutions are much more likely than private to provide opportunities for extraeducational programs: Associate Arts degree (26 percent versus 8 percent), nondegree study (84 percent versus 67 percent), cooperative work-study program (55 percent versus 23 percent), continuing education (74 percent versus 32 percent).

25. Do you give special privileges to spouses?
    a. extra consideration in admission. *Public:* 16. *Private:* 19. *All:* 18
    b. special transfer privileges. . . . *Public:* 0. *Private:* 7. *All:* 5
    c. special consideration for work done at another institution . . . *Public:* 0. *Private:* 9. *All:* 6

42

25. These percentages seem frightfully low. One major institutional change that would have many beneficial aspects is freer regulations on credit and transfer for spouses. To permit undergraduates to teach their own courses, to give more than 25 percent of the degree credit for independent study, and yet not to give spouses special transfer privileges is indeed surprising.

26. Do you encourage (or permit) students to delay their admissions?
    a. encourage . . . . . *Public:* yes 16, no 84
    Private: yes 6, no 94. *All:* yes 10, no 90
    b. permit . . . . . *Public:* yes 58, no 42
    Private: yes 89, no 11. *All:* yes 78, no 22

    26. Again it is surprising that 22 percent don't permit students to delay admission, since a year away from school has so universally been found to be salutary. Private colleges are much more flexible than public (89 percent versus 58 percent).

27. Do you encourage (or permit) students to take leaves of absence?
    a. encourage . . . . . *Public:* yes 26, no 74
    Private: yes 30, no 70. *All:* yes 28, no 72
    b. permit . . . . . *Public:* yes 81, no 19
    Private: yes 89, no 11. *All:* yes 86, no 14

    27. Fie on the 14 percent that do not permit students to take leaves of absence! This is evidence that some faculties believe to an unconscionable degree that education and personal growth can be programed, predetermined, prestructured, and even legislated.

28. Generally who is the instigator of curricular change?
    a. the faculty . . . . . *Public:* 90. *Private:* 61. *All:* 72
    b. the faculty senate. . . . . *Public:* 7. *Private:* 6. *All:* 6
    c. the dean's office . . . . . *Public:* 55. *Private:* 41. *All:* 46
    d. student-faculty committees . . . *Public:* 48. *Private:* 61. *All:* 56
    e. students . . . . . *Public:* 26. *Private:* 19. *All:* 21

29. Which constituencies have tended to give most support to curricular innovation?
    a. students . . . . . *Public:* 58. *Private:* 72. *All:* 67
    b. faculty . . . . . *Public:* 55. *Private:* 52. *All:* 53
    c. administration . . . . . *Public:* 65. *Private:* 65. *All:* 65
    d. alumni, alumnae . . . . . *Public:* 3. *Private:* 4. *All:* 4

30. Which constituencies have tended to give least support to curricular innovation?

43

a. students . . . . . *Public:* 6. *Private:* 2. *All:* 3
b. faculty . . . . . *Public:* 29. *Private:* 48. *All:* 41
c. administration . . . . . *Public:* 13. *Private:* 6. *All:* 8
d. alumni, alumnae . . . . . *Public:* 68. *Private:* 56. *All:* 60

28, 29, 30. The faculty institutes change; the students support it; the alumni oppose it. Unfortunately, the percentages here do not reveal the subtleties of change; there are some clues, however, for we see both support and opposition from faculty and administration. While faculty is more likely to instigate change at public colleges (90 percent versus 61 percent), faculty-student committees do so at private institutions (61 percent versus 48 percent). The support for curricular change comes mainly from students in private colleges, from administration in the public colleges.

31. Which of the following would you be most interested in discussing at the meeting? (Response to this question will assist arrangement of discussion groups.)
a. crediting students for off-campus experience . . . . . *Public:* 39. *Private:* 46. *All:* 44
b. creating specific high school–college affiliations to encourage work in school for degree credit . . . . . *Public:* 19. *Private:* 20. *All:* 20
c. evolving relationships between four-year colleges and the expanding junior and community colleges . . . . . *Public:* 29. *Private:* 32. *All:* 31
d. planning interdisciplinary instruction . . . . . *Public:* 55. *Private:* 56. *All:* 56
e. considering credit by examination . . . . . *Public:* 32. *Private:* 33. *All:* 33
f. providing alternating job and campus experience . . . . . *Public:* 23. *Private:* 13. *All:* 16
g. encouraging postponed enrollment and leaves of absence during college years . . *Public:* 16. *Private:* 15. *All:* 15
h. giving credit for independent work . . . . . *Public:* 39. *Private:* 46. *All:* 44
i. admitting students with advanced standing credit for a three-year bachelor's degree . *Public:* 36. *Private:* 39. *All:* 38
j. changing the 2+2-year structure of the undergraduate curriculum . *Public:* 26. *Private:* 44. *All:* 38

31. Areas of interest frequently give insight into future directions as well as into current problems. Interdisciplinary instruction

ranked first; from general comments, it would seem that interest in this area might well cut two ways. One is to suggest that the old academic disciplines are so narrow they do not reflect the breadth of interests that students currently have; a second way might well be that interdisciplinary study will make inroads into the often unassailable power of the departments, in a real sense inviting these vested interests to put together more flexible and responsive programs.

The other two popular responses were related to independent work and off-campus experiences. Both broaden the definition of academic discipline and imply a shift away from the grand design of scholarship imported from German universities.

It might be noted that public institutions are more interested in providing alternating job and campus experiences (23 percent versus 13 percent) but much less interested in the 2+2-year structure of undergraduate curriculum (26 percent versus 44 percent).

32. What are the burning educational issues at your college?
More options/fewer requirements, grading practices, credit for experiential activities, interdisciplinary studies, student-planned courses, cost effectiveness, minority studies, improving instruction, 4-1-4 school year, language requirement, self-evaluation, three-year degree.

33. Among the changes that have taken place during the last year or so, what innovations do you feel were most beneficial?
Experimental degree programs, fewer "core" requirements, experimental courses, pass-fail grading, credit by examination, 4-1-4, improved community relations, new forms of governance, changes in administration.

45